United Nations A/CN.10/PV.342

General Assembly

Official Records

Disarmament Commission

342nd meeting

Friday, 25 April 2014, 10 a.m.

New York

Chair: Mr. Drobnjak ..... (Croatia)

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

Agenda item 6 (*continued*)

Report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly at its sixty-ninth session

The Chairman: The Commission will continue its consideration of agenda item 6 in order to adopt the reports of the subsidiary bodies under agenda items 4 and 5, as well as the draft report of the Commission, as contained in documents A/CN.10/2014/CRP.2, A/CN.10/2014/CRP.3 and A/CN.10/2014/CRP.4, which have been circulated. There will be an oral amendment to one of the three document. Thereafter, the Commission will hear concluding statements by delegations.

To start the process of the consideration and adoption of the reports of the subsidiary bodies on individual agenda items, I will first call on the Chairs of each Working Group to introduce their respective reports.

I now give the floor to the Chair of Working Group I, on agenda item 4, entitled "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons", to introduce the report of his Working Group, as contained in document A/CN.10/2014/CRP.3.

Mr. Al-Sudairy (Saudi Arabia), Chair of Working Group I (*spoke in Arabic*): It is my great pleasure to present the report of Working Group I.

At the 337th plenary meeting held on 7 April, the Disarmament Commission adopted the agenda for its 2014 substantive session and decided to send agenda item 4, "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" to Working Group I. The Working Group under the chairmanship of the delegation of Saudi Arabia, met eight times between 9 and 24 April. The Disarmament and Peace Affairs branch of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management served as a secretariat for the Working Group. The Office of Disarmament Affairs served as adviser to the Working Group.

The Working Group held extensive discussions on agenda item 4. At its 1st meeting, on 9 April, I circulated a working paper dated 1 April 2014, which served as a basis for our discussions. At the 2nd and 4rd meetings, both held on 11 April, delegations exchanged views and made various proposals on the paper I submitted dated 10 April. At the 4th meeting, on 15 April, delegations exchanged views and made various proposals on the revised paper I submitted dated 14 April 2014. At our 5th meeting, on 17 April, the delegations exchanges views and made various proposals on the revised paper I submitted dated 16 April 2014. At the 6th and 7th meetings, on 22 April, delegations exchanged views and made various proposals on the working paper that I submitted dated 17 April. At the 8th meeting, on 24 April, I submitted a revised working paper dated 24 April 2014.

Following the discussions within the Working Group, I concluded that there was no consensus on the paper. I therefore decided to circulate the paper under

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

14-31529 (E)

Accessible document Please recycle

my own responsibility and without prejudice to the position of any delegation.

The following three documents were also presented to Working Group I — one for the Non-Aligned Movement, one presented by the representative of Iraq on behalf of the League of Arab States and a document presented by representative of Mexico. The Working Group, at the very least most of its members, expressed its appreciation to me and the Secretariat. At our eighth meeting on 24 April, the Working Group considered and adopted by consensus its report on agenda item 4. The Working Group also decided to make the document listed in paragraph 11 of the present report available to the 2015 substantive session of the Commission.

The Chair: There being no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report of Working Group I, on agenda item 4, as contained in A/CN.10/2014/CRP.3.

It was so decided.

The Chair: I would now like to move on to the report of Working Group II, on agenda item 5, entitled "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons", as contained in document A/CN.10/2014/CRP.4.

I now give the floor to the Chair of Working Group II to introduce the report of Working Group II.

Mr. Langeland (Norway), Chair of Working Group II: I have the honour to introduce the report of Working Group II. At the outset, I would like to thank members of the United Nations Disarmament Commission for the trust vested in me to chair the deliberations of that important Working Group.

Working Group II dealt with agenda item 5, entitled "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons", and held several meetings in the period from 10 to 24 April. The Working Group worked hard to reach agreement on concrete recommendations on confidence-building measures (CBMs) in the field of conventional weapons. Our deliberations at this year's session were based on the working paper from last year's session. During our meetings, we had constructive deliberations and we were able to develop a common understanding on a number of issues. I was pleased to note that we were making progress on the objectives for CBMs in the field of conventional weapons and on general considerations on CBMs in the field of conventional weapons. We also agreed upon a number of specific recommendations. Yet we were unable to reach consensus on all issues, such as, for example, the principal role of CBMs in the field of conventional weapons.

I believe that we fulfilled our deliberative mandate, but unfortunately we were unable to produce recommendations. Yet we were close.

I would like to thank the Chair for his support for me and his tireless efforts to build consensus among delegations. I would also like to thank the Secretary of Working Group II, Ms. Christa Giles, and her team, and Mr. Hideki Matsuno, from the Office of Disarmament Affairs, for his very able assistance.

I would very much like to thank all the delegations in the Working Group for their constructive participation in the deliberations and for the tone we struck in our Working Group. I really enjoyed chairing the Working Group. I think that we delivered results on a number of topics which could be a good basis for future work in the Disarmament Commission.

The Chair: There being no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report of Working Group II, on agenda item 5, as contained in A/CN.10/2014/CRP.4.

It was so decided.

The Chair: Having adopted all the reports of the subsidiary bodies of the Commission, I would like to thank the Chairs of the two Working Groups for their tireless efforts and dedication. The Commission is deeply indebted to them for their effective leadership in guiding the deliberations on these very complex issues. I thank them for their work not only this year but throughout the three-year cycle as well. I personally thank them for their assistance and cooperation and, once again, I praise their work.

We will now begin our consideration of the draft report of the Disarmament Commission, as contained in document A/CN.10/2014/CRP.2, as orally amended a half-hour ago. I have the pleasure of giving the floor to the Rapporteur of the Commission, Mr. Peter Winkler of Germany, to introduce the draft report of the Commission.

Mr. Winkler (Germany), Rapporteur of the Commission: It is my honour to introduce to the Disarmament Commission the draft report of the Commission on its 2014 substantive session, as contained in document A/CN.10/2014/CRP.2. The

draft report consists of four chapters: introduction, organization and work of the 2014 substantive session, documentation, and conclusions and recommendations.

As is customary, the final report is a factual description of the Commission's work and proceedings during the session. The substantive part comprises two reports of the Working Groups, which the Commission just adopted and which are part of the present report.

The Commission did not have parallel meetings. Given the deliberative mandate of the Commission, all submitted oral and written proposals contributed greatly to the objectives of the Groups. I was privileged to closely observe the tireless efforts of the Chairs of the two Working Groups and delegations to craft consensus on the substantive agenda items. I sensed that the deliberations and negotiations helped us in narrowing positions, but yet again, consensus was not within reach. Consequently, the Working Groups were not able to provide concrete recommendations.

I wish to take this opportunity to say that it has been a great honour to serve as the Rapporteur of this session and particularly to work under the able leadership of our Chair, Ambassador Vladimir Drobnjak.

Finally, allow me to extend my gratitude to Ms. Angela Kane, High Representative of the Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, for the counsel and support that her office provided to the bureau and Member States. Let me also express my sincere appreciation to Mr. Tegegnework Gettu, Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs and Conference Management, for the excellent organization and servicing of the Commission's meetings.

I wish to commend all members of the Secretariat for their tireless efforts and kind assistance. With these brief remarks, I recommend that the Commission adopt the draft report, as contained in document A/CN.10/2014/CRP.2.

The Chairman: We shall now consider the draft report of the Commission. The rules of procedure require that we examine the document chapter by chapter. If there are no comments on paragraph 1, "Introduction", I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt paragraph 1.

Paragraph 1 was adopted.

The Chairman: If there are no comments on chapter II, entitled "Organization and work of the 2014 substantive session", paragraphs 2 to 12, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopted paragraphs 2 to 12.

Paragraphs 2 to 12 were adopted.

The Chairman: We turn now to chapter III, "Documentation", paragraphs 13 and 14, as orally revised. If there are no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt chapter III, paragraphs 13 and 14, as orally revised.

Paragraphs 13 and 14, as orally revised, were adopted.

The Chairman: If there are no comments on chapter IV, entitled "Conclusions and Recommendations", paragraphs 15 to 17, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt paragraphs 15 to 17.

Paragraphs 15 to 17 were adopted.

The Chairman: May I take it that it is the wish of the Commission, having adopted all paragraphs of the draft report, to adopt the draft report of the Commission as a whole, as contained in document A/CN.10/2014/CRP.2, as orally revised?

The draft report, as orally revised, was adopted.

Concluding statements

The Chairman: It is my pleasure to give the floor to Ms. Angela Kane, High Representative for Disarmament Affairs.

Ms. Kane: I very much welcome the opportunity to address the 2014 substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, albeit at its closing plenary, as I was away on official travel at the beginning of the session.

I have come to the Commission today because I wanted to say that I cannot hide the regret and disappointment at the failure of the Commission to reach agreement on final documents. I had hoped that a growing recognition throughout the world of the magnitude of what is at stake in disarmament and non-proliferation, which has inspired calls for action in recent years, would be conducive to a positive outcome of the 2012-2014 cycle of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Unfortunately, the Commission's efforts remained unsuccessful in formulating recommendations for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, or for practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons.

Nevertheless, I cannot overstate my appreciation to Ambassador Drobnjak for his able stewardship and very constructive engagement as the Commission's Chair at this session. I also wish to thank the chairmen of the two Working Groups, Ambassador Al-Sudairy and Mr. Langeland, for their commitment to the process of deliberations and for their efforts to come up with a list of recommendations in relation to the two agenda items, respectively.

The Chairs have undoubtedly promoted constructive dialogue — which is after all the purpose of this deliberative body — and I wish to commend them on their commitment to the process of deliberations and for their tenacity in relentlessly pursuing their mandates. I also wish to thank the members of the Commission for their efforts to achieve a positive outcome, although in the end neither Working Group was able to reach consensus.

I believe that the Commission missed a good opportunity to build on the positive developments witnessed during the past year and to send a clear signal that the period of stagnation that had troubled the disarmament debate was over. Such a signal could have also spurred progress in other disarmament forums. Instead, with no consensus on the items before the Commission, the outcome of this session, and indeed of this cycle, adds to the unsatisfactory record in recent years. The lack of outcome at the end of yet another cycle may further test the Commission's credibility. We have reached a juncture here and the time has come to examine closely once again the Commission's methods of work.

We must, however, not allow this setback to undermine our collective efforts to advance the multilateral disarmament agenda. As we look towards the future, we know that the road ahead will be difficult. We must address the challenges ahead in a spirit of cooperation, not of confrontation, led by our shared values. I am confident that efforts will continue to be made to advance nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. I am equally confident that efforts will continue regarding practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons, as the adoption of such measures will contribute towards reducing or eliminating the causes of mistrust, fear, tensions and hostilities.

As the Deputy Secretary-General stated at the beginning of this session, "It is still possible for 2014 to be a year for the diplomatic bridge-builders of this world to carry the day" (*A/CN.10/PV.337, p. 2*). These are precisely the skills that will be most needed next week as the States Parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty assemble for this year's session of the Preparatory Committee for the Treaty's 2015 Review Conference. There are plenty of shared interests and ideals in this chamber today. Let us build bridges where we can and fight fires when we must. Let us never give up the search for ways to move the disarmament agenda forward.

The Chair: I thank Ms. Kane for her important statement.

I will now make a brief concluding statement in my capacity as Chair of the Commission.

First and foremost, I would like to thank all participants for all their valuable work, contributions and support to the Chair. In the end, we did not achieve the final goal, but we all put in considerable effort and came very close to it. Thus, I can say with confidence that we had a good session. We were not able to adopt either recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons or the practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. One can certainly regret such an outcome, but no one can say that we did not invest considerable effort in the process.

We had an open and rich discussion, with a strong desire to produce finally, after long years, a concrete outcome. The past three weeks have been a valuable and thoroughly multilateral engagement. The fact that we did not succeed should not be measured against our collective effort, but should primarily be placed in the much broader context of the complexity of contemporary international relations. In addition to that, the very specific rules under which the United Nations Disarmament Commission operates, especially the rule on consensus-based decision-making, certainly did not make our work easier.

Some will say that the Commission went further this year than ever before in this century. While we went far indeed, we did not go far enough. Nevertheless, I hope that our work constitutes a solid base for future meetings and considerations of the Commission and offers at least some contribution to the overall United Nations disarmament machinery. Our deliberations certainly provided us with a better understanding of our respective positions and deepened our awareness of the pivotal parts of the agenda. From that point of view,

the past three weeks were not time spent in vain. Our session confirmed a strong interest in the disarmament agenda among Member States. It must be noted that many stood ready to embrace a pragmatic approach for the sake of the common goal, despite differences in positions and national policies. One sentiment that I was able to detect across the aisle was the awareness of the imperative to bring relevance and credibility back to the United Nations Disarmament Commission mechanism to make it work again, as one representative elaborately put it.

The very fact that we are once again left without a result in spite of all our tries and all our flexibility raises some questions: can we continue the United Nations Disarmament Commission's business as usual? Is it possible, after all, to produce any result under the current rules of engagement? Should we narrow the annual agenda, focusing on specific themes? Today I cannot offer answers, but I think that we have reached a point when serious and thorough debate on these issues has become necessary.

My predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Malta, stated in his closing remarks in 2013 that we must restore a common sense of purpose to the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Those words are very much relevant today, if not more so than a year ago, and with those words I conclude my remarks and once again warmly thank all members for their valuable support.

The Commission is now ready to hear concluding statements by delegations.

Ms. Espinosa (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, allow me to thank you, Sir, on behalf of Ecuador, for the way you have conducted the three weeks of the United Nations Disarmament Commission's deliberations and for allowing me to speak this morning. I also appreciate the efforts of the Chairs of the two Working Groups.

My presence here shows the importance that President Rafael Correa's Government gives to the United Nations disarmament objectives and purposes and the work of the Commission. For my country, the two items on the agenda of this three-year cycle of the Commission — "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" and "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons" — are particularly important, as expressed in both our constitutional and legal framework and in the concrete actions taken by the State of Ecuador.

Our Constitution declared our national territory a zone of peace and guarantees that its citizens can live in a healthy environment. In this framework, Ecuador rejects and condemns the very existence of weapons of mass destruction on the face of the Earth and believes that their use or threat of use constitute a crime against nature and against humanity.

My country, as a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), supports the three pillars that form the basis of that regime: nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and the right of all NPT States Parties to develop nuclear energy for peaceful use. Those three pillars are equally important and inter-dependent.

However, we must note that, even in the deliberations of the Commission, concerns about the danger of the horizontal proliferation of these weapons — over which my country has also historically expressed its concern — are given priority, and that there is no control of the vertical proliferation of such weapons, as if the NPT had granted nuclear-weapon States not only exclusivity in possession but also the right to develop them and make them even more effective and deadly.

If we add that to the opposition that we unfortunately witness among some nuclear-weapon States and other States covered under so-called nuclear umbrellas to a deeper analysis seeking specific multilateral nuclear disarmament measures, we and the peoples of the world can see that nuclear disarmament, which is included among NPT obligations, is not a true priority for nuclear-weapon States. That is despite the fact that the General Assembly, in its first special session devoted to disarmament, declared unanimously that it was a priority.

My country is not willing to consider total and complete nuclear disarmament as a chimera, and we therefore reiterate our support for the international community's starting, as soon as possible, negotiations on a legally binding, universal treaty banning the development, possession, use and threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Ecuador is proud to have been part from the outset of the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America and the Caribbean created by the Treaty of Tlatelolco. For that reason, we support creating more nuclear-weapon-free

zones around the globe, in particular a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. We regret the unwarranted delay in convening the conference to create such a zone, and we therefore renew our call for it to be convened as soon as possible. Ecuador believes that should take place this year, in 2014.

Regarding confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms, I must recall the significant progress that we have made with our neighbouring countries, including Colombia and Peru.

With Colombia, we have developed coordination and cooperation mechanisms with full respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of both our nations. To that effect, we created mechanisms for ongoing communication at all levels, starting with the high military commands, and we maintain ongoing development and civil action plans for the border areas of both countries.

Among our cooperation mechanisms with Peru, I note with special pride the humanitarian demining process conducted by a binational team along our common border, which we expect to complete in October 2017, and whose successful lessons we are making available to the international community as an example of what cooperation can achieve in the area.

We are also creating new opportunities for integration, such as the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) and the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC), which have been has been a priority for President Correa's Government in helping to fulfil the dream of our founding fathers. In that regard, I recall the recent declaration of the Heads of State of Latin America and the Caribbean at the CELAC Summit in Havana in January, at which they signed a proclamation for peace as a part of our sustained political commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes, aimed at banishing the use of weapons and the threat of force in the region forever, a desire expressed by all our peoples.

Withn the South American framework, my country was one of the main promoters of the creation of the Union of South American Nations, whose General Secretariat is headquartered in Quito. Here we have made progress with concrete confidence-building measures, including the South American Defence Council. The Council is in fact one of the drivers of South American integration through its dynamism and development of various strategic themes for the region. This new regional defence architecture is aimed at advancing the construction of a shared vision of regional defence, in accordance with the statement by UNASUR Heads of State signed in Paramaribo in August 2013. In that regard, the South American Defence Council is working on regional defence challenges such as cyber-defence, the protection of our natural and strategic resources, cooperation in the defence industry and in training and capacity-building for civilians and military through the recently created South American School of Defence, launched by my country, which has offered to host its campus in Quito.

At the fifth Meeting of Ministers of the South American Defence Council, held in Paramaribo in February, a consolidated study of defence spending for 2006-2011 was presented, aimed at establishing a single transparent reporting mechanism for the region. It is an achievement on the part of UNASUR that it is helping to promote mutual confidence-building measures in South America within just a few years of the organization's founding. Apart from this, another initiative that Ecuador is promoting is the creation of a comprehensive system for the defence industry that will enable member States to learn about products offered by its industries as well as research projects being developed to create synergies and cooperaton. This year we will also hold a high-level conference on strategic thinking in the region, designed to introduce a shared vision of regional defence.

In conclusion, my country can only regret that on this occasion the Disarmament Commission has once again been unable to reach a consensus on recommendations. Historically, the Commission has been able to agree on consensus documents, such as that relating to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, which, I would like to recall, was formulated in a working group chaired by Ecuador. This shows that with sufficient political will to serve common interests it is possible to reach agreement.

This new failure should not push us into trying to seek partial reforms of the General Assembly's disarmament machinery. In Ecuador's opinion, any reform of that machinery should necessarily go through a fourth Sspecial session devoted to disarmament in order for us to define where we stand and where we want to go. My country, alongside the other members of the Non-Aligned Movement, has not ceased to call

for this, and we hope that we will see results as soon as possible.

My country, which is a land of peace, as mandated by its Constitution, within the regional zone of peace recently declared in Havana by the Heads of State and Government of Latin America and the Caribbean, reiterates its continuing commitment to peace and disarmament. We are firmly convinced that with the political decisiveness and commitment to the integrated life of all humankind and nature, we can all join together to attain the conflict-free world that all our peoples desire.

Mr. Andriashin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): My delegation would first like to thank you, Sir, for your contribution to the work of the Disarmament Commission during this session. The Russian delegation greatly appreciates your professionalism, support and efforts aimed at achieving a constructive dialogue within our forum. We wish you every possible success in your work in the future. We would also like to specially thank the Chairs of the Working Groups for their untiring efforts and focus on positive results. And we would like to thank the Secretariat of the Commission for its valuable help with our work.

In consideration of the importance of current discussions of the issue of outer space as a weapon-free zone, Armenia, Belarus, Venezuela, the People's Republic of China, Kyrgyzstan, Russia and Tajikistan, with the support of Pakistan, have prepared a discussion document on confidence-building measures in the area of conventional weapons with special attention to outer space, which I hope will be circulated in this room to all participants. The document is exclusively informational in nature, designed, as I have said, to provide food for thought. The goal is to focus the international community's attention on the issue of outer space. We call on all States to consider the ideas laid out in the document and to see it as a first step towards possible further discussions of the issue within the framework of the Disarmament Commission. We are open to any suggestions, and we hope to have further fruitful cooperation with all Member States in this forum.

We would also like to thank all likeminded Strates for their assistance with the document during this session.

Mr. El Oumni (Morocco): I would first like to thank you, Sir, tor your leadership. We would also like to express our appreciation to the Chairs of Working Groups I and II, Ambassadors Naif bin Bandar Al-Sudairy of Saudi Arabia and Knut Langeland of Norway, for their tireless efforts to achieve a consensus. We would also like to express our appreciation to all the delegations for their active and constructive engagement.

We share in the feelings of disappointment, but we are not really surprised. We had a good cycle, with good discussions on substantive issues. We were very close to a successful conclusion, but once again we let the opportunity slip. We did not take the chance of trying to achieve a small success that could have allowed the Disarmament Commission to start the next cycle in a different mood. In that regard, we agree with the words of the Deputy Secretary-General in his opening statement at this substantive session, when he said that he hoped the beginning of a new cycle in 2015 would usher in fresh hope and lead us away from the current impasse.

Once again, we feel it is important to remind ourselves that we support multilateralism, and that system should continue to be useful and productive. We want consensus, and we should prove that it can be a way for us to move together and in a collective manner towards successful conclusions and not a means for sustaining a stalemate. We attach high importance to the disarmament machinery. We need to allow it to fulfil its mandate.

We need to think carefully and profoundly on the way ahead, as stated in your closing remarks, Sir. We will, in the near future, put forward ideas on measures that the United Nations Disarmament Commission, in our view, should take to fulfil its deliberative mandate and agree on recommendations. That will include proposals on refining the agenda to allow the Commission to deliberate in depth on specific issues in the framework of the same agenda items. We will also suggest considering an agreement on a list of focused issues that may cover more than one cycle.

Mr. Yennimatas (Greece): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union and its member States. The candidate countries the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia; the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; as well as Ukraine align themselves with this statement.

First of all, let me thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ambassador Vladimir Drobnjak of Croatia, and all the members of the Bureau for your tireless efforts during this year's session, which concluded this three-year-cycle of the Disarmament Commission.

Regarding the substantial work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, however, we wish to express our deep regret that, at this session, the Commission has failed to produce recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and on practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons, as mandated by the General Assembly.

After 15 years of deadlock, it is time to take a sincere look at the United Nations Disarmament Commission's working methods, in particular its current agenda, which is over-politicized. In our view, the Disarmament Commission should shift its focus from a three-year cycle to discussing specific topics, such as new emerging challenges in arms control. Those specific topics could be decided by the General Assembly on an annual basis. The Commission should then report back to the General Assembly on its deliberations, including on agreed recommendations.

Finally, we believe that there is an imbalance between the amount of energy and resources devoted to the Commission's proceedings and its concrete results. We deem it essential to consider reducing the duration of substantive sessions and the frequency of Working Group meetings.

Mr. Dehghani (Islamic Republic of Iran): Once again, the United Nations Disarmament Commission has failed to produce a substantive outcome. You, Mr. Chair, are definitely not responsible for that failure. You did an excellent job in steering the work of the Commission, especially as you engaged in informal consultations and tried your best to bridge the divide. You deserve our sincere gratitude. Similarly, the Chairs of the two Working Groups of the Commission did everything they could to reach an agreed outcome, including by preparing different revisions of the non-papers. They therefore deserve our special appreciation. We should also thank Ms. Angela Kane and the Commission's secretariat for their valuable efforts and contributions to the work of the Commission.

The Non-Aligned Movement, as a large group, has also contributed to the work of the Commission by submitting a comprehensive working paper on nuclear disarmament and demonstrating maximal flexibility with the hope of achieving an agreed outcome. Many individual countries have an important role to play in enriching the deliberations. They work in a spirit of compromise and professionalism. In turn, my delegation also participated actively and constructively in the deliberations of the Working Groups by submitting many proposals to improve the non-papers. I would like to take this opportunity to especially thank all the representatives, who supported many of our amendments. As a result of that, the amendments are reflected in the non-papers.

Certainly, the Commission's structure, methods of work and rules of procedure should not be considered the source of its failure this year, as this body, with the same rules of procedure, structure and methods of work, has produced over a dozen important guiding principles in the past. As the sole deliberative body of the United Nations on disarmament issues, the United Nations Disarmament Commission needs to be enabled to perform its important role of formulating concrete recommendations and guidelines, in particular on nuclear disarmament. That is, indeed, a collective responsibility, and requires genuine political will by all States and their constructive engagement, spirit of cooperation and compromise.

It is extremely disappointing that one of the main reasons for the Commission's failure this year was the objection of only one party to the inclusion of a date for the convening of an already delayed conference on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. As we all well know, that conference has been repeatedly postponed over the past several years due to the refusal of that party to participate in it. It once again proved that not only are its nuclear weapons, unsafeguarded nuclear activities and non-adherence to international treaties prohibiting weapons of mass destruction the only obstacle in the way of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, but its unconstructive policies prevent international forums from fulfilling their supportive role in the establishment of such a zone. That, of course, has occurred with the full support of that party's main supporters, who are among the sponsors of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, which, almost two decades after its adoption, has yet to be implemented. That also indicates how unhelpful the role of such countries is in the implementation of the 1995 resolution and the convening of the conference on

the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

The annual adoption of a resolution by consensus in the General Assembly since 1982 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East demonstrates how strongly that idea is supported by the international community. As called for in that and other resolutions, the only State that is not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) should take the practical and urgent steps required for the establishment of such a zone, including accession to the NPT, the placement of all its nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency comprehensive safeguards and the renunciation of the possession of nuclear weapons. Equally important, according to that resolution, is that nuclear-weapon States and all other States render their assistance in the establishment of the zone and refrain from any actions that run counter to both the letter and spirit of that resolution.

As in the past, another reason for the Commission's failure this year is the inflexible position of certain nuclear-weapon States. The lack of political will on the part of those countries is also the main obstacle to prolonging the multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament and the lack of progress in achieving the objectives of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Those countries, by continuing to conduct nuclear weapon tests in alternative ways, modernize their nuclear arsenals, share nuclear weapons with other countries, enhance the role of such weapons in their military and security doctrines and transfer nuclear material, technology and know-how to States not parties to the NPT, are in clear violation of their explicit legal obligations. Indeed, that has negative consequences for the credibility of the NPT and the non-proliferation regime and therefore should be stopped. Such countries should comply with their legal obligations and unequivocally undertake the total elimination of their own nuclear weapons. They need to shoulder their special responsibility in taking forward multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. That is indeed only possible if they demonstrate flexibility and a strong and genuine political will and not employ rhetoric or make euphemistic statements.

In conclusion, my delegation invites certain nuclear-weapon States and certain States not parties to the NPT to revise their unconstructive approach and join other countries in reactivating the multilateral disarmament machinery and taking forward deliberations and negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Nuclear disarmament should remain the international community's highest priority, and every effort should be made to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons. To that end, we call for negotiations to begin as soon as possible within the Conference on Disarmament towards a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons. Such a convention, when adopted and implemented, can realize our long-standing demand for a more secure world free of nuclear weapons, and a place where all nations and generations can live free from the fear of those inhuman weapons.

Mr. Primasto (Indonesia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). I would first like to convey the Movement's appreciation, Sir, for the hard work and leadership that you have displayed throughout our deliberations. NAM would also like to thank the Chairs of the Working Groups I and II, Ambassadors Naif bin Bandar Al-Sudairy and Knut Langeland, for their tremendous efforts in building consensus, as well as the Secretariat, for its valuable assistance during our deliberations.

As was stated at the beginning of this year's session, the Movement has engaged constructively in the discussions and, moreover, has shown a very high level of flexibility in the pursuit of concrete recommendations on issues on the Commission's agenda. The Movement therefore regrets that this session, the last of the current cycle, was unable to agree on substantive recommendations, despite NAM's constructive role in making concrete proposals throughout the deliberations. Recalling the Movement's constructive engagement, and its proposals submitted to the Commission on nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, we again call on United Nations Member States to display the political will and flexibility needed to enable the Commission to agree on substantive outcomes in its next cycle.

In closing, the Movement would like to once again underscore its long-standing position regarding the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, and to express its determination to promote multilateralism as the core principle of negotiation in those areas. The Movement also reaffirms the relevance and centrality of the Disarmament Commission, with its universal membership and as the sole specialized body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery

for considering disarmament issues and submitting concrete recommendatins to the General Assembly.

Mr. Al-Hajri (Oman) (*spoke in Arabic*): On behalf of the Arab Group, my delegation would like to express its appreciation and thanks to you, Sir, for your efforts in conducting the work of the 2014 session of the Disarmament Commission. It has become clear to everyone that you are committed to seeing this session succeed, and that you have spared no effort to that end. We would also like to thank the Chairs of the two Working Groups, Ambassadors Naif bin Bandar Al-Sudairy and Knut Langeland, who have led the Groups for the past three years and have brought us to a stage where we were close to reaching a certain consensus, a conclusion that would crown our work with success.

The Arab Group has supported the work of both Working Groups, and was ready to accept the working paper submitted by the Chair of Working Group I, on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. The Disarmament Commission would have been about to achieve consensus, had it not been for a few obstructive delegations obstructing the opportunity to reactivate the Commission and, indeed, the United Nations disarmament machinery in general.

But despite the failure to achieve consensus on the working paper because of some States' inflexible positions, and despite the fact that this prevented the paper's official release, this has shown everyone how objective and balanced the paper is. We would like to affirm the importance of the recommendations the paper contains, particularly with reference to the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks negotiations on a convention regarding the filing for the transfer of nuclear weapons, as well as its request that a conference on a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction be held as soon as possible in 2014.

The Arab Group has said time and again that it is flexible and open to any additional ideas regarding the reactivation of the Disarmament Commission, although the problem really lies in a lack of political will. But some delegations, as I said, blocked consensus, and the Arab Group calls on those States to reconsider their positions and join the international consensus seeking nuclear disarmament at the international and regional levels. We must work together to achieve the goal we have been striving to reach for so long, that of avoiding the potentially disastrous consequences of nuclear weapons.

The work ahead will be difficult, but the goal is noble and merits our continued pursuit of further efforts to achieve it. We are ready to continue to work constructively and participate actively in order to arrive at a world free of nuclear weapons. Once again, we thank you for your efforts during this session, Sir, and we look forward to the next as we work towards this noble end.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to join previous speakers in expressing its appreciation for your important, capable leadership, Sir. Under your able leadership, we were almost able to produce a consensus paper, and yet regrettably, on the final day, here we are with no positive outcome. But that does not mean we did not invest enough time or effort. Under your able leadership, Mr. Chair, we exerted every effort, and we highly appreciate your great work and that of the Chairs of Working Group I and Working Group II. We congratulate all the Chairs on their success in bringing together the different views. Of course, as I said, we are still far from reaching consensus, but one day we will reach a consensus.

In addition, with regard to the remarks by Ms. Angela Kane, High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shares her regret and takes note of the points raised.

There are a number of very pressing issues, but the Democratic People's Republic of Korea firmly believes that nuclear disarmament is the first priority of all the outstanding issues. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has been supporting proposals for nuclear disarmament, which was reflected in at least one paragraph. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea highly appreciates that.

On this occasion, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to draw the attention of representatives to the issue of the pressing need for nuclear disarmament. We would like to look at two very outstanding issues — one concerning the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the other concerning Israel — in which one can easily see how great the challenge of nuclear disarmament is.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea made a speech in the general debate (see A/CN.10/PV.338) and we have drawn the attention

of the Chair and representatives to what is happening on the Korean peninsula; to the cause of the tension there, and to how dangerous it is for peace and security on the Korean peninsula. The largest nuclear-weapon State continues to challenge peace and security on the Korean peninsula, causing a lot of trouble for peace by continuously bringing in, on the pretext of joint military drills, B-52 bombers, aircraft carriers, nuclear-powered submarines and destroyers armed with Tomahawk missiles. All means of nuclear weapon strikes are targeted at Pyongyang. The largest nuclear-weapon State is not hiding the purpose of its joint drill.

Today is the final day of the so-called joint drills. It is no longer a drill. It has been holding the drill every year for about 20 years. It is ready to attack the Democratic People's Republic of Korea at any time. This time it has openly declared its intention. Pyongyang's is a target in its landing exercise. Therefore, that nuclear-weapon State is pushing the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to increase the effectiveness of its nuclear deterrent for self-defence purposes to defend of its sovereignty and its survival.

There is another development in the Middle East. What happened with regard to the meeting? One country did not agree to the zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. Many countries — including countries of the Non-Aligned Movement, together with Arab countries — joined that initiative, but again, the support of the largest nuclear-weapon State encouraged the only nuclear-weapon State in the Middle East to increase its nuclear capabilities by refusing to reflect those important fundamental issues in a paragraph in the agreement. Supported by the double standard of the largest nuclear-weapon State, that Middle Eastern nuclear-weapon State even attacked the Chair of Working Group I. That is unprecedented and should not go unaddressed.

In a nutshell, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has closely observed those two developments. In conclusion, we can say that the largest nuclear-weapon State is not in favour of nuclear disarmament. It is only in favour of nuclear proliferation by pushing the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to increase its nuclear capabilities and strengthen its nuclear deterrent on the Korean peninsula. On the other hand, in another part of the world — the Middle East — it openly supported another nuclear-weapon State represented in this room in developing its nuclear capabilities.

Mr. Sarki (Nigeria): I thank you very much, Mr. Chair, for giving me the floor to deliver these closing remarks on behalf of the African Group. On behalf of the African Group, I would like to thank you for your leadership during this session of the Disarmament Commission. You have shown patience, perseverance and commitment to obtaining concrete, substantive and useful outcomes. Through no fault of your own, sadly, that could not be achieved.

We also commend the members of your Bureau for their dedication and hard work throughout the session. The African Group also wishes to thank the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ms. Angela Kane, for her very wise and very frank remarks this morning. I do hope we will all take heed of what she has said.

The African Group also wishes to express its gratitude and appreciation to the Chairs of the two Working Groups of the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 2014 session, Prince Naif bin Bandar Al-Sudairy of Saudi Arabia and Mr. Knut Langeland of Norway, my immediate neighbour, for their work and impressive facilitation of deliberations throughout the outgoing cycle. We commend their efforts at working assiduously to ensure a successful outcome of the final session in the cycle.

We also associate ourselves with the closing remarks made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Let us remind the Commission of the remarks made by the Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations, on 7 April, at the opening of the session, when he spoke of the General Assembly being

> "[m]oved by anxiety at the general lack of confidence plaguing the world and leading to the burden of increasing armaments and the fear of war" (*A/CN.10/PV.337, p. 1*)

He was, of course, quoting from the first sentence of resolution 502 (VI), which established the original Commission in 1952. Regrettably, as Ms. Kane said, we have not been able to move our deliberations to a successful conclusion. We hope that the beginning of a new cycle in 2015 will usher in fresh hope that will lead us away from the current impasse.

The Commission's function as a deliberative body with the responsibility to consider and make recommendations on various issues in the field of disarmament and to follow up on the relevant decisions and recommendations of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament must be reinforced by commitments from individual Member States towards effective and verifiable disarmament, especially in the area of nuclear weapons.

The situation becomes even more urgent with regard to the convening of a conference on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. The African Group seizes the opportunity to reiterate its earlier call, and those of the overwhelming majority of Member States, for the Secretary-General of the United Nations to continue working with the facilitator to convene the conference without any further delay in 2014. That is our firm position. We are conveying it through you, Sir, to the Secretary-General. Let there be no misunderstanding of our position in that regard.

It is regrettable that today, in April 2014, we are debating the convening of a conference that should have been held in December 2012. We are still in the first quarter of 2014 and we are convinced that, with commitment and the demonstration of the necessary political will, we can reach the goal of the resolution adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons with the participation of all States of the region without exception.

Furthermore, the African Group continues to stress the importance of multilateral diplomacy on the issue of disarmament and non-proliferation. We commend other representatives for their courtesies and professionalism during the session and further underscore the need to look to the future with hope even as we prepare for the new cycle in 2015.

Finally, we wish to express our appreciation to the staff of the secretariat of the Disarmament Commission for providing the necessary support and assistance to delegations.

Mr. Moktefi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Allow me to start by extending to you, Mr. Chair, the Algerian delegation's heartfelt thanks for your efforts and for the outstanding way in which you have led our work today. We would also like to extend our gratitude to the members of the Bureau. My delegation would also like to thank and express its sincere gratitude and appreciation to Ambassador Naif Bin Bandar Al Sudairy, Chair of Working Group I, and Mr. Knut Langeland, Chair of Working Group II, for the commendable efforts and the professionalism with which they led the work of the two Working Groups.

The Algerian delegation associates itself with the statements made by the representatives of Indonesia, Nigeria and Oman, delivered respectively on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, the African Group and the Arab Group.

Given the nature of the conclusions of our work, and as was stated by the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ms. Angela Kane, my delegation cannot but express its regret and disappointment at the inability of the Commission to adopt concrete recommendations by consensus on both items on its agenda, even though it should be noted that progress was made in the negotiations as we carried out our work. And on the eve of the conclusion of our work, some significant progress was made and hope arose for seeing the recommendations adopted by consensus. However, it was not possible at the last minute to reach that consensus, which was so desired. Faced with this situation, it is clear today that the reasons for the blockage that has prevented the Commission from fulfilling its mandate lie in the lack of political will.

Despite that fact, my delegation wishes to reaffirm its trust in the Disarmament Commission as the sole specialized deliberative body within the framework of the United Nations Disarmament architechture. In that context, Algeria reiterates its support for the convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which could serve as an opportunity to reaffirm the mission of the disarmament mechanisms and to forge a new consensus on the priorities in the field of disarmament within the framework of a comprehensive consideration of the disarmament issue. Algeria reaffirms its commitment to fully respecting the principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations, especially Articles 1 and 2, including the principle of the right to self-determination of peoples under colonial domination or other forms of domination or foreign occupation.

My delegation also reiterates its position of principle, which is that it considers the complete elimination of nuclear weapons to be a top priority. To that end, it is important to ensure the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, to which

the international community is committed. Therefore, the establishment of a nuclear-weapons-free zone and a zone free of other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East is absolutely essential to moving the issue of nuclear disarmament forward and to preserving peace and stability in the region, as was decided in the action plan contained in the outcome document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. My country therefore urges the Secretary-General and the three sponsors of the 1995 resolution, in close consultation and coordination with the States of the region, to make every effort to organize the conference on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East before the end of 2014 at the latest.

Mr. Abbas (Iraq) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to express its appreciation to you, Mr. Chair, for your efforts at this session of the Disarmament Commission and over the past few years to reach a consensus by adopting the papers containing recommendations for the achievement of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Through you, Sir, I would like to extend my thanks to Mr. Naif bin Bandar Al-Sudairy, Chair of Working Group I, and Mr. Knut Langeland, Chair of Working Group II, for their professionalism in conducting our work over the past year. We benefitted greatly from their experience and their skills. We would like to express our thanks and appreciation to Ms. Angela Kane for her intervention today and to the members of the Bureau and the secretariat.

My delegation would like to express its support for the statement made by the representative of the Sultanate of Oman on behalf of the Group of Arab States and the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

We confirm the important role played by the Disarmament Commission as the deliberative multilateral body concerned with disarmament issues. We would like to express our disappointment that we have not been able to achieve a consensus with regard to recommendations on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and confidence-building measures on conventional weapons, despite the sincere efforts made over the past three years of our session. My delegation, like other member States, had hoped that we could achieve progress and adopt the two papers submitted by the Chairs of the Working Groups on recommendations and considerations contributing to the achievement of regional and international peace and security.

Our inability to adopt the recommendations contained in the two papers and to achieve positive results leading to our objective reflects the impasse that the Disarmament Commission has faced since 2000. In this regard, my delegation calls on Member States to show greater flexibility and political will, and to spare no effort to make the next session a success in moving towards general and complete disarmament, in accordance with the 1978 special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, so that the Commission may resume its role of making recommendations on nuclear disarmament.

We share the view expressed by other speakers that nuclear disarmament should be our top priority because of the destructive nature of such weapons, in accordance with the outcome document of the special session. We also agree that there is a need to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones throughout the world, including in the Middle East, which would contribute to ridding the world of nuclear weapons. Through you Sir, we call for a conference to be convened on the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East, as was supposed to be held in 2012. In the light of the outcome of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we appeal to the United Nations and the facilitators to step up their efforts to hold such a conference in 2014 without further delay.

Mr. Neto (Brazil): First of all, I would like to thank you, Sir, for all your efforts. As a member of the Bureau myself, I can testify to your tireless efforts and hard work to achieve good results in the Commission. We would also like to thank the Chairs of the Working Groups and Ms. Angela Kane for her statement today to the Commission. Wewould like, through the delegation of Ecuador, to thank the Ecuadorian Minister for Defence for addressing the Commission.

Brazil takes a very serious approach to the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which we value very highly. As you have stated, Sir, our deliberative mandate has been accomplished because we have successfully understood one another's positions and carried out deliberations throughout these three weeks. We regret, however, that we could not ultimately agree on an outcome by consensus. That lack of agreement is regrettable, considering the dimension of the challenges that we face in the field of peace and security.

The lack of agreement in the Disarmament Commission is of particular concern when at the same time some delegations would like to further address the issues of peace and security in other forums of the United Nations, such as the Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals, for instance. It is especially complex to start a discussion on peace and security in the context of the post-2015 development agenda if we cannot advance in the fundamental bodies devoted to disarmament, such as the Disarmament Commission, the Conference on Disarmament and the review process of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or if their decisions are not fully implemented.

As my delegation stated during the debate held yesterday in the General Assembly on ensuring stable and peaceful societies, in order to truly advance in the field of peace and security we should begin by reviewing the implementation of disarmament commitments by nuclear-weapon States, the disruptive consequences of unilateral foreign intervention, embargoes and sanctions, as well as the notion that the most powerful are exceptional and may selectively place themselves above international law. The lack of agreement in the Disarmament Commission has a systemic effect reaching far beyond the Commission itself. If the international community truly desires to address peace and security in a sustainable way, we need to change the approach we take towards this Commission and to the disarmament machinery as a whole.

Finally, let me recall my country's position that the difficulties that we face in the Disarmament Commission are primarily political rather than procedural. We should not take a mere economic or budgetary approach to tackling difficulties as we move ahead in the Disarmament Commission. We should try, rather, to bridge the differences through further dialogue and deliberations.

Mr. Al-Sudairy (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): On behalf of my delegation, I congratulate you, Sir, on the excellent manner in which you have conducted the affairs of the Disarmament Commission. After 15 years, we came very close to reaching consensus. I congratulate you, Sir. Saudi Arabia aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Oman on behalf of the Group of Arab States. Allow me to thank you and our colleagues for your efforts over the past few days. As is well known, my delegation very much hoped to achieve the objectives of the Commission; we wanted to adopt recommendations by consensus. My delegation hopes that the substantive session to come will be more positive and succeed in making some real progress.

In conclusion, I would like to thank you, Sir, the secretariat, the Disarmament Affairs Division and all members of the Bureau. I also thank those delegations who supported me as Chair of Working Group I throughout the three-year cycle.

Mr. Kılıç (Turkey): We worked hard for three weeks. We covered much distance to bridge gaps and came very close to consensus. Even though our deliberations and discussions were useful, we regret to leave another three-year cycle behind us without tangible results. Again, this is disappointing, to say the least. However, we commend you, Sir, and the Chairs of the two Working Groups for your tireless and constructive efforts to bring us to verge of consensus. We also thank High Representative Kane for her thought-provoking statement.

We take this opportunity to express our expectation that a conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons as mass destruction be convened as soon as possible. To that end, we call on all relevant parties to undertake a constructive approach and exert genuine efforts for the expeditious realization of such a conference.

Different views have been expressed on why we are not able to achieve results. Some point to the lack of political will; others to our working methods. It is clear that greater political will and flexibility would move us forward, but it is also clear that our working methods could be revised. We have always expressed the view that consensus should be sought on matters pertaining to national security, but also believe that there is some practical streamlining that we could do with the contribution of all delegations. Progress in this body could have a knock-on effect on the rest of the disarmament machinery. We are convinced that no delegation in this room would like to see another cycle without results. Therefore, we should work together and have a dedicated discussion on how to jump-start this body.

We wish to express once again our appreciation to you, Sir, the Chairs of the Working Groups and the members of the Bureau, and remain hopeful that we will achieve results next year so that we can produce

results and cast away the doubts about the Commission's relevance and credibility.

Mr. Varma (India): We would like to thank you, Mr. Chair, for your outstanding leadership of the 2014 substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. We would also like to commend the diligent efforts of the Chairs of the two Working Groups, Ambassador Naif bin Bandar Al-Sudairy and Mr. Knut Langeland, for their energetic efforts in carrying forward the work of the two Working Groups.

We would like to recognize the presence of the Secretary-General's High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ms. Angela Kane, and her support and that of the Secretariat for the work of the Commission.

India has consistently attached high importance to the Disarmament Commission as the specialized deliberative leg of the triad of the disarmament machinery put in place by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD I). As the only body with universal membership for in-depth deliberations on relevant disarmament issues, the Commission plays a unique and important role. It is for that reason that India has been deeply supportive of the Chairs' efforts and has sought to participate in the deliberations of the two Working Groups in a constructive spirit to enhance the prospects of consensus. We do not believe that the working methods of the Commission are to blame for its disappointing results this year.

We also associate ourselves with the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

India attached high importance to the work under the agenda item "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons". We believe that the working paper contained in document A/CN.10/2014/WG.I/WP.3/Rev.1, submitted by the Chair of the Group, provided a good basis for consensus among Member States.

It would have been befitting if the Disarmament Commission, as one of the three pillars of the disarmament machinery put in place by SSOD I, after consideration of this agenda item, which is a priority not just for India, but for the vast majority of Member States, had in its recommendations called for the commencement in the Conference on Disarmament, the world's single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, as part of a balanced and comprehensive programme of work, of negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear weapons convention. India also attached importance to the other recommendations in that document, though some may not be as fulsome and as evolved as we would have liked them to be. In the prevailing circumstances of stress on the international disarmament agenda, adoption of those recommendations would have made a positive contribution to global disarmament efforts.

We also participated actively in the discussions under Working Group II. We were happy to see that the emphasis in the Chair's working paper on confidence-building measures (A/CN.10/2014/WG.II/WP.3) was agreed and initiated on a voluntary, consensual and reciprocal basis. We believe that the initiation of a confidence-building process must be decided among States freely and in exercise of their sovereignty. In elaborating practical confidence-building measures in the area of conventional weapons, we should take advantage of the guidelines on confidence-building measures endorsed by the General Assembly at its forty-first session.

We share the disappointment of several delegations at not being able to reach consensus on the recommendations. We continue to believe, however, in the inherent value of this universal forum. The Commission has had several successes in the past and there is no reason why we cannot repeat such successes in the future. In view of the importance attached by the vast majority of Member States to agenda items 4 and 5 and the view expressed by many delegations on the paucity of time to reach consensus, we hope that the General Assembly will continue to support the consideration of those two subjects by the Commission in its future sessions.

Mr. Wang Daxue (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): At the outset, on behalf of the Chinese delegation I wish to express our appreciation to you, Mr. Chair, and the two Chairs of the Working Groups for your outstanding work and tireless efforts. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ms. Angela Kane, for her participation in today's meeting. Her remarks were thought-provoking.

The Disarmament Commission, the First Committee of the General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva make up the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery put in place by the Final Document (resolution A/S-10/2) of the first

special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Over the years, that machinery has made a positive contribution to maintaining and promoting peace, stability and security throughout the world. In recent years, the Disarmament Commission has reached an impasse. We regret that this year's session failed to achieve substantive results. China believes that this situation is the result of a lack of political will on the part of the parties concerned and is also related to overall international security circumstances.

China reaffirms its support for, and the importance it attaches to, that machinery, including the Disarmament Commission. We call upon the parties concerned to exercise flexibility. We are ready to work with the parties concerned to further bolster the Disarmament Commission with a view to overcoming the impasse.

Mrs. Del Sol Dominguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): We very much appreciate your efforts, Mr. Chair, to achieve a consensus on the agenda items before the Commission.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

It is particularly disturbing that today we are reaching, without any outcome, the end of the three-year cycle of consideration of two highly relevant issues — recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and practical recommendations on confidence-building measures in the area of conventional weapons. It is beneficial for everyone that we have a body with universal membership that makes it possible for us to deliberate in depth on highly relevant issues, but that is not enough. Our mandate does not only include deliberations, rather it also includes the production of concrete recommendations and we have to recognize that we have not achieved that goal.

Unfortunately, the same situation that occurred in past years has occurred once again. We believe that it is not a mere coincidence that the Conference on Disarmament has not begun substantive negotiations in many years and that the General Assembly continues to adopt dozens of relevant resolutions on disarmament that are simply never put into effect. Cuba supports optimizing the disarmament machinery of the United Nations, including the Disarmament Commission. However, we do not share the position of those who question the relevance of the Commission and attribute the lack of concrete results to the ineffectiveness of the Commission's working methods. Such an approach diverts the focus from the genuine obstacles we face.

The real difficulty in the Disarmament Commission is rooted, first and foremost, in the lack of political will on the part of some States to achieve real progress, especially with regard to nuclear disarmament. Cuba continues to work to strengthen the key role of the Disarmament Commission and of the General Assembly in the area of nuclear disarmament.

We reiterate that the mere existence of nuclear weapons and doctrines on the possession and use of such weapons is a threat to international peace and security. For that reason, nuclear disarmament is and must continue to be the highest priority in the area of disarmament. It is simply unacceptable that in this day and age tens of thousands of nuclear weapons continue to exist, with the capacity to destroy the world several times over. Cuba will continue to work tirelessly in the Commission and elsewhere until we achieve the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons and their elimination from our planet.

The fact that the Commission did not agree on concrete recommendations on nuclear disarmament should not stop our efforts to continue to work to achieve that result. Nuclear-weapon States have a fundamental responsibility to achieve that goal. It is not enough to just express the desire to achieve a world free from nuclear weapons. Such a declaration must result in the negotiation of legally binding measures that completely prohibit nuclear weapons and destroy existing weapons. The importance of nuclear disarmament cannot be ignored or minimized. Nuclear-weapon States have a legal obligation to hold and conclude negotiations in good faith to achieve nuclear disarmament in a verifiable, transparent and irreversible way.

As regards practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons, as we stated in the meetings of the Working Group, Cuba supports such measures as one way to strengthen international peace and security, provided they are carried out with full respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Because of the voluntary nature of confidence-building measures, such measures cannot be imposed, and there are no one-size-fits-all solutions.

I would like to conclude by expressing our thanks to you, Mr. Chair, and the other members of the Bureau for the work that you have carried out. We are particularly

grateful for the tireless efforts of the Chairs of the two Working Groups, who did not for even a moment give in to frustration in carrying out their important work. We would also like to thank the entire Secretariat team for their valuable support.

Mr. Nitzan (Israel): I will be very brief. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you again, Mr. Chair, for your tireless efforts to lead this work and try to build consensus between all Member States and the participants in this meeting. We highly appreciate the way in which you engaged with all the delegations here in a professional, fair and unbiased manner. Your leadership almost brought us to a successful outcome.

Mr. Aljowaily (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, on behalf of my delegation, I would like to join others in aligning myself with the statements made by the representatives of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, Nigeria on behalf of the Group of African States, and Oman on behalf of the Group of Arab States. I would also like to extend our most sincere thanks and express my appreciation for the efforts that you have made, Mr. Chair, to achieve success in the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Our thanks also go to the Chairs of the two Working Groups, Ambassador Al-Sudairy and Mr. Langeland. I also express my thanks to Ms. Angela Kane, High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, and congratulate her on her efforts in support of disarmament. We have heard statements by the Minister of Defence of Ecuador and a number of other high-level participants at this session.

(*spoke in English*)

This is not the first time that we have addressed the issue of the Commission's discussions and their potential outcome. The only thing I wish to add are two brief messages for those who were not here during the closed consultations — which were more the norm in the work of the Commission over the past three weeks — and even for those who did attend and participate in its deliberations.

First, I urge them to judge for themselves and not judge the issues on the basis of anyone's statements — including my own, for that matter. I urge them to read what would have been the draft outcome, which is contained in document A/CN.10/2014/WG.I/WP.3/Rev.1. I urge them to read it. I will read it again. I invite those who were not in the closed consultations to read it and those who were in the consultations to read it again. Is there anything in the working paper, which was put forward for adoption by a group of States after having been presented by the Chair, that does not reflect the facts, that does not reflect realities and that does not reflect objectivity and the lowest common denominator of what we could have agreed upon after three weeks of deliberations this year and three years of deliberations this cycle? I urge them to not judge on the basis of my statement, but to judge it with their hearts and minds. Is there anything in that paper that does not reflect the actual state of affairs?

I speak in particular to those speakers who took the floor to block consensus on the working paper and who referred to two paragraphs: paragraph 2, which notes the fact that the General Assembly resolution did call for the commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on the convention on the prohibition of nuclear weapons; and paragraph 4, which urges the convenors of the Middle East conference to continue what they are doing right now. It does not even ask them to do anything new; it just asks them to continue doing what they are doing right now in order to fulfil a mandate that was entrusted to them by the final outcome of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The first message is that they should judge for themselves.

The second message is the following — denying these facts does not make these facts wither away. It does not make these two facts — that there is a General Assembly resolution and that there is a call for a conference — wither away. What does it deny us? It denies us the opportunity to inject energy into the disarmament machinery. It denies us the opportunity to reinvigorate the disarmament machinery. But it does not deny the facts that there are those two goals, and that those two goals will not wither away and will continue to be defended by those who truly and genuinely believe in the goal of global disarmament.

We have done what we can, as I believe we all have — those of us who have a genuine commitment to fulfilling the obligations that were already undertaken in other forums or other processes. There are those who wish to see those facts wither away, but they will not. We will continue on in our commitment, as was very well and particularly eloquently expressed by the representatives speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Group of African States and the Group of Arab States. Having missed the opportunity in this

process, we do not think that we have missed it elsewhere. The mere fact that we are convening on Monday for the third session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is another opportunity for us to implement what we have already agreed upon.

I appreciate, Mr. Chair, the sincere efforts that you have exerted and the openness with which you have conducted these meetings, and I thank the two Chairs of the Working Groups. I appreciate the work of the secretariat, led by Ms. Angela Kane, and look forward to a successful outcome next time.

The Chair: Before I bring this meeting to an end, allow me to express my gratitude to all delegations for their constructive spirit, which was also demonstrated today during the debate. I thank them for the support extended to me and other members of the Bureau, who helped me to shoulder the responsibility of running the Commission smoothly. I am particularly thankful to them. I once again thank both of the members of the Bureau. Last but definitely not least, I would like to thank in particular the Secretary of the Commission, the Secretaries of the Working Groups and staff members of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management and the Office for Disarmament Affairs. I cannot praise enough their professionalism and dedicated assistance. I also thank the interpreters, conference officers, document officers and sound engineers. I thank them all.

Closure of the session

The Chair: I declare closed the 2014 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.